

NATIONAL INTELLIGENCER.

THE UNITED STATES AND TEXAS.

We lay before our readers, some other documents in the series of those from which the injunction of secrecy has lately been removed by the Senate.

The most material points disclosed by these papers are—

First. That there is no written evidence in the Department of State of the important fact stated in Mr. Ursinus's letter of January 16th, 1844, that the proposition of this Government for the annexation of Texas had been for the present declined by the Government of Texas. We thus learn that one, at least, of the most important communications between this Government and Texas was not made in writing. There are other communications, no doubt, of equal importance, of which no record has been preserved. We have seen among the documents, for example, no written or printed account of the agreement or understanding between the two Presidents as to the employment of our land and naval forces, the commander of the former of which is instructed to put himself, as promptly as practicable, in communication with the President of Texas. There must have been some such agreement or understanding; or how would the President of Texas know for what purpose the commander of the forces of the United States had put himself in communication with him?

Secondly. That our Government was well aware, when it volunteered its proposition to Texas to be annexed to the United States, that the Government of Mexico "did not regard Texas as an independent Power, but as a rebellious province," and would act accordingly in its relations with Texas.

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS

IN RELATION TO THE U. STATES AND TEXAS, FROM WHICH SECRECY HAS BEEN REMOVED.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

WASHINGTON, MAY 3, 1844.

To the Senate of the United States:

In answer to the resolution of the Senate of the 29th ult., requesting a copy of additional papers upon the subject of the relations between the United States and the Republic of Texas, I transmit a report from the Secretary of State and the documents by which it was accompanied.

JOHN TYLER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, MAY 2, 1844.

To the President of the United States:

SIR: The Secretary of State, to whom was referred the resolution of the Senate of the 29th of last month, requesting the President to communicate to that body a copy of the answer of the Secretary of State to the letter of the Texian Charge d'Affaires of the 14th of December, 1843; of the letter of Mr. Murphy of July 8th, 1843; and of the communication of the Texian Charge d'Affaires referred to in Mr. Upshur's letter of January 16th, showing that the proposition of this Government for the annexation of Texas had been, for the present, declined by the Government of Texas, has the honor to lay before the President a copy of the two first-mentioned papers, and of others connected with them.

There is not on the files of this Department any communication from the Charge d'Affaires of Texas showing that the proposition of this Government for the annexation of that country to the United States was temporarily declined, nor anything to show that such communication was ever made, in writing, to the late Mr. Upshur.

All which is respectfully submitted.

J. C. CALHOUN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, FEBRUARY 24, 1844.

14th of December and 24th ult., of Mr. Van Zandt, Charge d'Affaires of Texas, the first inviting the attention of this Government to the character of the war waged by the Mexican Republic against Texas, and the other relating to the intervention of the Government of the United States and of other Governments, for the purpose of bringing about a peace between those two countries. In reply, the undersigned has the honor to inform Mr. Van Zandt that a copy of the notes referred to has been communicated to the Minister of the United States at Mexico, with an instruction from this Department upon the subjects to which they relate.

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity to inform Mr. Van Zandt renewed assurances of his high consideration.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. Webster to Mr. Thompson.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 31, 1843.

SIR: I transmit a copy of the letter of the Secretary of State, dated the 14th ult., requesting the intervention of this Government for the purpose of inducing that of the Mexican Republic to abstain from carrying on the war against Texas by means of predatory excursions, in which the proclamations and promises of the Mexican commanders are flagrantly violated, non-combatants seized and carried off, property of war, and private property used and destroyed. This Department entirely concurs in the opinion of Mr. Van Zandt that practices such as these are not justifiable or sanctioned by the modern law of nations. You will take occasion to converse with the Minister of the United States at Mexico, and represent to him how greatly it should contribute to the advantage as well as the honor of Mexico to abstain from predatory incursions and other similar modes of warfare. Mexico has an undoubted right to re-subjugate Texas if she can, so far as the United States are concerned, by the common and ancient law of nations. But other States are interested;—and especially the United States, a neighbor to both parties—are interested not only in the restoration of peace between them, but also in the manner in which the war shall be conducted, if it shall continue. These arguments may suffice for what you are requested to say, amicably and kindly, to the Mexican Secretary at present in London, and for your information, that a proper settlement of this Government to renege in a more formal manner with Mexico at a period not far distant, unless she consent to make peace with Texas, or shall show disposition and ability to prosecute the war with respect-ful force.

The second note of Mr. Van Zandt is dated the 24th inst., and relates to the mediation of the United States for the purpose of effecting a recognition by Mexico of the independence of Texas. You will not cease in your endeavors for this purpose, but it is not expected that you will deviate from the instructions which have heretofore been given to you upon the subject.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. Van Zandt to Mr. Webster.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 24, 1843.

SIR: The undersigned, Charge d'Affaires of the Republic of Texas, has been instructed to communicate to Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, the following information, with the desires of the Government of Texas in respect to the same, to which Mr. Webster's attention is respectfully invited.

Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain having agreed, by the terms of a convention concluded at London on the 14th of November, 1840, between Her Majesty's Government and the Republic of Texas, to tender her good offices for the purpose of effecting an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing between the Government of Mexico, and the Republic of Texas, pending between Texas and the present same to the Mexican Government, in Mexico to these instructions, the mediation of Great Britain was proposed and accepted by the Government of Mexico, and resort to arms, sought to avoid a further collision between the three great Powers, the United States, France, and England, of the difficulties under to might be secured. To this France gave their assent with alacrity, while the Government of the United States, though expressing a decided desire to do all in its power, by its good offices, to assist in the opinion that it would be better on all accounts that each party should act separately but similarly in point of tone and

argument in urging the Mexican Government to reconsider the subject dispassionately and impartially, and to lose no time in coming to an amicable adjustment with Texas on the basis of a recognition of her independence." This suggestion of the British Government has been communicated by Lord Conley (the English ambassador at Paris) to the French Government, which has approved of the same, and forwarded the necessary instructions upon the subject to her Minister in Mexico. It is therefore the desire of my Government, in order that there may be a concert of action, that the Government of the United States will, as early as possible, (should the same meet with its concurrence,) forward the necessary instructions to the American Minister in Mexico, that he may act actively upon the subject.

Should the proposed mediation be rejected by Mexico, and should the mediation still continue the harassing phantom of the re-subjugation of Texas, then the responsibility of the consequences which must inevitably result will rest upon her head. Texas will have washed her hands from the blood of those who perish in the fatal strife, having sought by every honorable means to avoid the calamities of war and the miseries and destruction of human life which must follow. An appeal to arms must then determine the contest. If forced to this resort, Texas, conscious of the correctness of her motive and the justice of her cause, will, relying upon the God of battles, take the issue and abide the result.

Actuated by an overruling necessity and the paramount principle of self-preservation, the Government of Texas has sanctioned the partial invasion of the Mexican territory, that we might remove the ravages and horrors of war (which the Mexican Government designed to inflict on us) from our own country to that of our enemy. Our object is not to extend our limits, to make conquests of any portion of the territory of Mexico, or to instigate upon her citizens the cruel and inhuman treatment which has characterized her warfare against us. But in battling for peace, even upon our enemies' soil, while they shall feel the force of freedom's arm nerved to the conflict by repeated wrongs and injuries, our acts shall still be governed by a nobleness of principle and a magnanimity which will conduct us to peace, and become the descendants of that race from whom we claim our origin.

I avail myself of this occasion to offer Mr. Webster renewed assurances of my distinguished consideration.

ISAAC VAN ZANDT.

Hon. DANIEL WEBSTER, &c.

Mr. Thompson to Mr. Webster.—[EXTRACT.]

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

MEXICO, MARCH 14, 1843.

In obedience to your instructions, I then alluded, in the most friendly and respectful terms, to the fact that the war now going on between Mexico and Texas, and told him that, whilst our Government was determined to observe the strictest neutrality in that war, it felt that it was its duty to remonstrate in the most respectful manner with both Governments against the predatory forays, really not war, which were now made by Mexico, that you can obtain upon both the abandonment of such a system, the only consequences of which were individual suffering and calamity. He replied, (very much excited,) that Mexico did not regard Texas as an independent Power, but as a rebellious province, and that prisoners taken were not entitled to any of the privileges of prisoners of war, but that you can obtain upon both the abandonment of such a system, the only consequences of which were individual suffering and calamity. He replied, (very much excited,) that Mexico did not regard Texas as an independent Power, but as a rebellious province, and that prisoners taken were not entitled to any of the privileges of prisoners of war, but that you can obtain upon both the abandonment of such a system, the only consequences of which were individual suffering and calamity.

JOHN TYLER.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, MAY 2, 1844.

To the President of the United States:

SIR: It is a painful part of my duty, and of extreme delicacy in regard to my predecessors, to make known to the Department of State that the friendly policy of the United States towards the Republic of Texas seems to have been generally disapproved by the Government of Mexico, and that the Government of Mexico seems to have been generally disapproved by the Government of the United States. I have endeavored to trace this feeling to its source, and in that effort have been led to believe that it has arisen partly from a general misunderstanding, or want of information of the true policy of the United States towards this Republic and that of Mexico, and partly from the fact that our public archives have not been always or wholly laid before the eye of public curiosity. I have more than once heard the substance of despatches from the Government of the United States to the Government of Mexico, and from the Government of Mexico to the United States, (which from their very nature must have been intended to be secret to our own legation, and purely confidential,) talked of and discussed by well informed political disputants, and cited on one occasion to prove that Texas could not look to the United States for countenance and support in any emergency, but that her whole hope rested upon the friendly offices of England and France.

I have been laboring since I have been here to place the archives which I have in some state of regularity, and to make them accessible to the public. But it is a vain effort, as you know, that a single man can do. I have, however, been able to place a few of the most important documents upon the subject of the relations between the United States and Mexico, and of the intervention of the United States and of other Governments, for the purpose of bringing about a peace between those two countries. In reply, the undersigned has the honor to inform Mr. Van Zandt that a copy of the notes referred to has been communicated to the Minister of the United States at Mexico, with an instruction from this Department upon the subjects to which they relate.

The undersigned avails himself of this opportunity to inform Mr. Van Zandt renewed assurances of his high consideration.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. Webster to Mr. Thompson.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 31, 1843.

SIR: I transmit a copy of the letter of the Secretary of State, dated the 14th ult., requesting the intervention of this Government for the purpose of inducing that of the Mexican Republic to abstain from carrying on the war against Texas by means of predatory excursions, in which the proclamations and promises of the Mexican commanders are flagrantly violated, non-combatants seized and carried off, property of war, and private property used and destroyed. This Department entirely concurs in the opinion of Mr. Van Zandt that practices such as these are not justifiable or sanctioned by the modern law of nations. You will take occasion to converse with the Minister of the United States at Mexico, and represent to him how greatly it should contribute to the advantage as well as the honor of Mexico to abstain from predatory incursions and other similar modes of warfare. Mexico has an undoubted right to re-subjugate Texas if she can, so far as the United States are concerned, by the common and ancient law of nations. But other States are interested;—and especially the United States, a neighbor to both parties—are interested not only in the restoration of peace between them, but also in the manner in which the war shall be conducted, if it shall continue. These arguments may suffice for what you are requested to say, amicably and kindly, to the Mexican Secretary at present in London, and for your information, that a proper settlement of this Government to renege in a more formal manner with Mexico at a period not far distant, unless she consent to make peace with Texas, or shall show disposition and ability to prosecute the war with respect-ful force.

The second note of Mr. Van Zandt is dated the 24th inst., and relates to the mediation of the United States for the purpose of effecting a recognition by Mexico of the independence of Texas. You will not cease in your endeavors for this purpose, but it is not expected that you will deviate from the instructions which have heretofore been given to you upon the subject.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. Van Zandt to Mr. Webster.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 24, 1843.

SIR: The undersigned, Charge d'Affaires of the Republic of Texas, has been instructed to communicate to Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, the following information, with the desires of the Government of Texas in respect to the same, to which Mr. Webster's attention is respectfully invited.

Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain having agreed, by the terms of a convention concluded at London on the 14th of November, 1840, between Her Majesty's Government and the Republic of Texas, to tender her good offices for the purpose of effecting an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing between the Government of Mexico, and the Republic of Texas, pending between Texas and the present same to the Mexican Government, in Mexico to these instructions, the mediation of Great Britain was proposed and accepted by the Government of Mexico, and resort to arms, sought to avoid a further collision between the three great Powers, the United States, France, and England, of the difficulties under to might be secured. To this France gave their assent with alacrity, while the Government of the United States, though expressing a decided desire to do all in its power, by its good offices, to assist in the opinion that it would be better on all accounts that each party should act separately but similarly in point of tone and

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. Van Zandt to Mr. Webster.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 24, 1843.

SIR: The undersigned, Charge d'Affaires of the Republic of Texas, has been instructed to communicate to Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, the following information, with the desires of the Government of Texas in respect to the same, to which Mr. Webster's attention is respectfully invited.

Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain having agreed, by the terms of a convention concluded at London on the 14th of November, 1840, between Her Majesty's Government and the Republic of Texas, to tender her good offices for the purpose of effecting an amicable adjustment of the difficulties now existing between the Government of Mexico, and the Republic of Texas, pending between Texas and the present same to the Mexican Government, in Mexico to these instructions, the mediation of Great Britain was proposed and accepted by the Government of Mexico, and resort to arms, sought to avoid a further collision between the three great Powers, the United States, France, and England, of the difficulties under to might be secured. To this France gave their assent with alacrity, while the Government of the United States, though expressing a decided desire to do all in its power, by its good offices, to assist in the opinion that it would be better on all accounts that each party should act separately but similarly in point of tone and

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

DANIEL WEBSTER.

Mr. Van Zandt to Mr. Webster.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, JANUARY 24, 1843.

SIR: The undersigned, Charge d'Affaires of the Republic of Texas, has been instructed to communicate to Mr. Webster, Secretary of State of the United States, the following information, with the desires of the Government of Texas in respect to the same, to which Mr. Webster's attention is respectfully invited.

My opinion is, notwithstanding all their vanishing and gasconade, that the most agreeable thing to the State of Texas would be, that the most agreeable thing to the Government to put an end to the war, as he would then say that we were too strong for them to contend with.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WADDY THOMPSON.

Mr. Calhoun to Messrs. Van Zandt and Henderson.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, MAY 15, 1844.

The undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, will thank Mr. Van Zandt and General Henderson to furnish him with any information that may be in their power in reference to any armistice, or proposed armistice, between Texas and Mexico, and the circumstances connected with the same.

The undersigned avails himself of the opportunity to offer Mr. Van Zandt and General Henderson renewed assurances of his distinguished consideration.

J. C. CALHOUN.

Messrs. Van Zandt and Henderson to Mr. Calhoun.

The undersigned, &c., in reply to the note of Mr. Calhoun, Secretary of State of the United States, of yesterday's date, have the honor to submit for his information the following facts in relation to the origin and history of the alleged armistice between Mexico and Texas, to which he refers.

By the terms of a convention concluded between Texas and Great Britain on the 14th of November, 1840, the British Government agreed to offer its mediation for the settlement of the difficulties between Mexico and Texas, upon the basis of the recognition of the independence of Texas by Mexico.

In pursuance of this convention, the mediation of Great Britain was tendered to and declined by Mexico, as before mentioned, and was utterly below the notice of the President of Texas.

Afterwards, in the year 1842, representations were made by Texas to Great Britain, France, and the United States, requesting their joint interposition for the settlement of the difficulties between Mexico and Texas. To this request, the Governments of France and the United States, as before mentioned, have not yet responded.

The British Government, however, for reasons deemed by it sufficient, declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

Subsequently, the Texian Charge d'Affaires in London was informed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the British Government, that the British Government, as before mentioned, had declined to be thus associated, suggesting, at the same time, that each might act separately.

My opinion is, notwithstanding all their vanishing and gasconade, that the most agreeable thing to the State of Texas would be, that the most agreeable thing to the Government to put an end to the war, as he would then say that we were too strong for them to contend with.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

WADDY THOMPSON.

Mr. Calhoun to Messrs. Van Zandt and Henderson.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

WASHINGTON, MAY 15, 1844.

The undersigned, Secretary of State of the United States, will thank Mr. Van Zandt and General Henderson to furnish him with any information that may be in their power in reference to any armistice, or proposed armistice, between Texas and Mexico, and the circumstances connected with the same.

The undersigned avails himself of the opportunity to offer Mr. Van Zandt and General Henderson renewed assurances of his distinguished consideration.

J. C. CALHOUN.

Messrs. Van Zandt and Henderson to Mr. Calhoun.

The undersigned, &c., in reply to the note of Mr. Calhoun, Secretary of State of the United States, of yesterday's date, have the honor to submit for his information the following facts in relation to the origin and history of the alleged armistice between Mexico and Texas, to which he refers.

By the terms of a convention concluded between Texas and Great Britain on the 14th of November, 1840, the British Government agreed to offer its mediation for the settlement of the difficulties between Mexico and Texas, upon the basis of the recognition of the independence of Texas by Mexico.

In pursuance of this convention, the mediation of Great Britain was tendered to and declined by Mexico, as before mentioned, and was utterly below the notice of the President of Texas.